UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,178	08/02/2001	Craig Lewis	52646-00408USPT	7529

26231	7590	02/15/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/922,178	LEWIS, CRAIG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Minh Dieu Nguyen	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 November 2005*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-19,21-27,29 and 30* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *8,20 and 28* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.　　A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 23, 2005 has been entered.

2.　　This action is in response to the communication dated November 23, 2005 with the amendments to claims 1, 13 and 24.

　　　Claims 1-30 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3.　　Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant arguments focus on the combination of features introduced by the amendment with elements that already existed in the claims. The new material is rendered obvious by Arnold et al. (6,601,175), Challener et al. (6,718,468), Ryu (6,067,625),Thompson et al. (6,725,382), Henn et al. (2004/0139349), Warn (5,270,943) and Kidder et al. (2004/0031030).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 4-5, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 21, 23-26 and 29 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Challener

et al. (6,718,468) and further in view of Ryu (6,067,625).

       a)   As to claims 1, 13 and 24, Arnold discloses a method and system for

providing password protection for data processing system through the use of limited-use

machine-specific passwords comprising generating a password in response to an

occurrence of a prescribed password generation event (Fig. 5A, element 178); providing

the generated password to an operating system security module (Fig. 5A, element 172).

       Arnold discloses storing the password for use in connection with a secure

operating system login access (col. 7, line 56 to col. 8, line 9), however he does not

disclose producing a coded password as a function of the generated password, wherein

the generated password can be determined by decoding the coded password and

storing the coded password.

       Challener discloses a method and system for providing data security comprising

producing a coded password as a function of the generated password (Fig. 2A, element

46; col. 4, lines 42-62); and storing the coded password (col. 4, lines 37-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of producing a coded password as a function of the generated password, wherein the generated password can be determined by decoding the coded password in the system of Arnold as Challener teaches so as to provide more data security.

Arnold and Challener do not explicitly disclose displaying the coded password to a user of the computer system, wherein the user can receive the generated password by providing the coded password to a remote password provider.

Ryu discloses displaying the coded password to a user of the computer system (col. 2, lines 34-37), wherein the user can receive the generated password by providing the coded password to a remote password provider (col. 2, lines 38-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of displaying the coded password to a user of the computer system, wherein the user can receive the generated password by providing the coded password to a remote password provider in the system of Arnold and Challener as Ryu teaches so as to obtain the needed password for accessing the information.

b)   As to claims 4, 16 and 25, please see addressed above claim 1

c)   As to claims 5, 17 and 26, Arnold as modified discloses the prescribed password generation event includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a computer system power up; a computer system re-boot; expiration of a prescribed time duration from an immediately preceding password generation event; restoration of a

security level from a modified security level to a default security level, and occurrence of

a secure operating system login access (col. 8, lines 16-17).

d)   As to claim 9, Arnold as modified discloses generating the password

includes generating the password for a prescribed username (col. 3, lines 33-43).

e)   As to claims 10, 21 and 29, the examiner takes official notice that the user

accesses the system needs the username. The user is understood to mean a person

(i.e. a service person, a repair person, an administration person) therefore username

includes a service username.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ the use of service username in the prescribed username so as to

specifically generate and assign user account.

f)   As to claims 12 and 23, Arnold as modified discloses the computer system

includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a stand-alone computer

system and a stand-alone network of computer systems (Fig.1).

6.   Claims 2-3 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Challener et al. (6,718,468) in view of Ryu

(6,067,625) and further in view of Thompson et al. (6,725,382).

Arnold, Challener and Ryu do not disclose overwriting a previously generated

password or previously stored coded password.

Thompson discloses a security mechanisms for thwarting theft or unauthorized access of devices and particularly to password mechanisms comprising overwriting any previous value of password (col. 6, lines 32-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of overwriting previous value of password as Thompson teaches in the system of Arnold, Challener and Ryu so as to maintain the updated password.

7.   Claims 6, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold et al. (6,601,175), in view of Challener et al. (6,718,468), in view of Ryu (6,067,625) and further in view of Henn et al. (2004/0139349).

Arnold, Challener and Ryu do not disclose the modified security level of a password generation event.

Henn discloses a method and system for secure pervasive access comprising a change in the security level of a certain application without changing the application function to be accessed (page 2, paragraph [0023]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of changing in the security level within the application as Henn teaches in the system of Arnold and Challener so as to protect the security of the system.

8.   Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Challener et al. (6,718,468) in view of Ryu

(6,067,625) and further in view of Kidder et al. (2004/0031030).

Arnold, Challener and Ryu do not explicitly disclose searching a username

registry of the dedicated application upon the occurrence of the prescribed password

generation event and removing any invalid usernames from the username registry.

Kidder discloses searching a username registry of the dedicated application upon

the occurrence of the prescribed password generation event (paragraph [0307], i.e.

during login, the server searches the database for matching username) and removing

any invalid usernames from the username registry (paragraph [0324], i.e. if a rogue user

is identified, the its profile is deleted).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ the use of searching a username registry of the dedicated

application upon the occurrence of the prescribed password generation event and

removing any invalid usernames from the username registry in the system of Arnold,

Challener and Ryu as Kidder teaches so as to keep the registry up to date with valid

information.

9.   Claims 11, 22 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Challener et al. (6,718,468) in view of Ryu

(6,067,625) and further in view of Warn (5,270,943).

Arnold, Challener and Ryu do not disclose the dedicated application includes a point of sale application in a fuel dispensing environment.

Warn discloses a system for controlling fuel dispensers through a PC-based point of sale application software (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of point of sale application in a fuel dispensing as Warn teaches in the system of Arnold and Challener so as to integrate pump control with other features (Abstract).

Allowable Subject Matter

10.   Claims 8, 20 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior arts do not disclose upon the occurrence of the prescribed password generation event, reviewing privileges associated with respective valid usernames in the username registry and resetting the privileges of the respective valid usernames to prescribed default settings.

Conclusion

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00-2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-

2100.

Minh Dieu Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2137

mdn
2/9/06

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER